arXiv:1610.07725v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 25 Oct 2016

Rigidity-induced recovery of Fourier's law in low dimensional momentum-conserving systems

Dye SK Sato*
Earthquake Research Institute, University of Tokyo, 1-1-1 Yayoi, Bunkyo, Tokyo 113-0032, Japan
(Dated: October 26, 2016)

Based on the fluctuating elastic equations, we show possible universality of the recovery of Fourier's law in low dimensional momentum-conserving systems. In our mode coupling analysis, the anomaly of heat conduction is cut by rigidity in dimension: $d > 1$. Combining a previous work for $d = 1$ [Phys. Rev. E 94, 012115] and analyzing the renormalization group, we pronounce on the significance of reversible restoring forces competing with dissipations in momentum transport for the recovery, which break the hyper-scaling between viscosity and heat conductivity.

I. INTRODUCTION

For the description of macroscopic dynamical systems, its transport behavior is considerably significant as thermodynamics. Actually, many fluidic systems are dynamically described by only two components: thermodynamics and the dissipative transport of conserved quantities [1]. Thus we need to know the correspondence between transport and microscopic motions as well as the equilibrium statistical mechanics to clarify the dynamical aspects of many particle systems.

We now take heat conduction as an example. Macroscopic dissipative transport is well described by irreversible thermodynamics phenomenologically [2]. There is a linear relation called *Fourier's law* between energy current (J) and spatial gradient of temperature (T) in heat conduction of the large systems

$$J = -\kappa \nabla T, \quad \kappa \propto N^0. \tag{1}$$

κ is a size (N) independent phenomenological constant called heat conductivity. Its intensive property allows us to describe the transport in a system-size independent manner. Thus our interest is now focused on the origin of this relation. Answering this question, linear response theory [3] connects the transport with microscopic particle motions. Particularly, Green Kubo formula clarifies the relation between this dissipation process (heat diffusion in heat conduction) and microscopic fluctuations. Defining spatially integrated energy current $\hat{J}$ and equilibrium average $\langle\rangle$, this is written as

$$\kappa = \frac{1}{NT^2} \int dt \langle J(0)J(t)\rangle. \tag{2}$$

The findings of the fluctuation theorem brushed the derivation up and now we can naturally combine thermal perturbations with mechanical perturbations in its formulation [4].

However, recent detailed studies clarified the fragility of this relation compared with the relation of the static cases [5–9]. Concretely speaking, this Green Kubo relation highly depends on the situations of descriptions, particularly on systems sizes [5–8]. This tendency is quite crucial in low dimensional (dimension: $d \leq 2$) momentum-conserving systems including fluids and solids. In those systems, the intensive property of transportation coefficients is broken [5, 6, 8]. This fact is well studied in heat conduction, called *anomalous heat conduction*, where heat conductivity shows the positive size-dependence of power law as

$$\kappa \propto N^\alpha, \ \ \alpha > 0. \tag{3}$$

The heat conductivity in these systems is considered to grow up as the system size increases, which means the divergence of transportation coefficients in the thermodynamic limit and the breakdown of Fourier's law, the absence of macroscopic descriptions on transportations [8–10]. The reason behind this phenomenon is considered as the coupling of thermal fluctuations and momentum conservations [6, 7], although both of the two properties are naturally expected features in many systems. Because of the universality of the causal physics, there are many evidences based on theories, simulations and experiments of this anomaly [8, 10–12]. Actually, the exponent of this anomaly α takes the universal value $\alpha = (2 - d)/(2 + d) + 0$ [10]. On the other hand, if one accepts this anomaly, he cannot have the phenomenological descriptions of transports in low dimensional systems anymore. Are there really no transportations to be described phenomenologically in low dimensional momentum-conserving systems?

Quite recent studies partially answered this question, i.e. there are surely some dissipative transports which have well-defined thermodynamic limits in these systems (*recovery of Fourier's law*) [13]. This findings began with molecular dynamics simulations [14]. Now, many molecular dynamics simulations reported the saturation of anomalous heat conduction at larger sizes than the size satisfying the anomalous heat conduction. Some simulations [15, 16] were pointed out their artifacts [17], but more examples of the recovery of Fourier's law have still been reported [13, 18–20]. Many paradigms of anomalous heat conduction are now known to be able to show the recovery (e.g. Diatomic hardcore particles [18], FPU-β [19, 20]).

* dice@eri.u-tokyo.ac.jp

The possible origin of the recovery is also readily reduced by the detailed simulations[19–23]. Some results clarified the significance of thermally activated dissociations and the increase of pressure for this recovery [20, 22]. Particularly, the study reporting the pressure-induced recovery of Fourier's law [20] theoretically reproduced the anomaly cutoff caused by pressure fluctuations seen in their simulations. They calculated the mode coupling theory (MCT) on the fluctuating hydrodynamic equations [24], which had been ordinarily considered as the theoretical foundations of the anomaly [7, 10], and explicitly showed the existence of the anomaly cutoff caused by the pressure fluctuations. The pressure is just the factor which removes the anomaly in their analysis [20] and not considered in the previous studies for one dimensional case (noisy Burgers equations [7, 25]). Thus now we can understand this recovery of Fourier's law in one dimensional cases even in the realm of this classical theory. The significance of strain (thus pressure) has been recently recognized [19]. On the other hand, however, the result of [20] is strongly limited in one dimensional cases. This limitation is clear in two dimensional cases, because some works of the anomaly applicable to two dimensional cases (stirring incompressible fluids [7]) already considered the effect of pressure appropriately. Therefore, the two explanations show the crucial discrepancy. Thus, it is still unclear whether the recovery of Fourier's law is universal or not in low dimensional momentum-conserving systems.

In this paper, we claim that the universality of the recovery of Fourier's law in low dimensional momentum-conserving systems and that the origin is the existence of reversible restoring forces competing with momentum dissipations. Our first evidence of the claim is based on fluctuating elastic equations [26]. It strongly asserts that low dimensional solids, and even viscoelastic systems of infinitesimal rigidity, recover Fourier's law. One dimensional cases are rather special. The second evidence of the claim is based on one dimensional fluctuating hydrodynamic equations. Because of the mass conservation, the reversible forces of pressure fluctuations must compete with the dissipation of momentum, and it causes the same effect in $d = 1$ with rigidity in $d > 1$. The significance of pressure fluctuations in one dimensional cases [20] is interpreted to be caused by shear viscosity banishment (in other words, the competition of volumetric viscous motions and pressure fluctuations). Also, we found a mistake of renormalization group (RG) calculations, particularly the renormalization into the noise term in [20] thus we fix it here. In other words, they showed the accurate results of MCT for transportation coefficients but the RG result of them is wrong. The fix shows that the intrinsic point is not the existence of a new fixed point (that was wrong) but the long range interactions of elastic reversible forces. It results in the breakdown of the hyper-scaling between viscosity and heat conductivity. In summary, the recovery is caused by the *competition of reversible restoring forces and dissipative forces* in the momentum transportations. This is schematically formulated as follows, defining the characteristic sizes N_* of the balance between the dissipative forces and the restoring forces,

$$\kappa(N) \sim (\min[N, N_*])^\alpha. \tag{4}$$

This mechanism governs the recovery of Fourier's law in low dimensional momentum-conserving systems.

The construction of the left paper is as follows. First, in *Setting* section, we introduce the fluctuating elastic equations [26]. We appropriately combine the elastic order effects to the fluctuating hydrodynamic equations there. Second, in *Result* section, we show the MCT result of the anomaly cutoff induced by rigidity based on these equations. Third, in *Discussion* section, we discuss the correspondence of our results with previous works. We show the RG results of solids in $d > 1$ and fluids in $d = 1$.

II. SETTING

Fluctuating hydrodynamic equations describe the slow motions of conserved quantities (mass, momentum and energy) in the semi-macroscopic scales, where the systems mostly obey the macroscopic deterministic descriptions but non-negligible thermal fluctuations would disturb the motions [24]. Assuming the existence of such scales and the slowness of conserved quantities' motion even in the scale, fluctuating hydrodynamic equations describe the dynamics of such semi-macroscopic scales statistically. The existence of such semi-macroscopic scales have been readily clarified by recent simulations [27]. Also, the spatiotemporally slow motions (much slower than the other motions) of conserved quantities follow the increase of the system sizes as seen in the simulations of short range interaction models of fluids. Here we assume the existence of systems obeying such equations, and study what happens in these systems.

Ordinary fluctuating hydrodynamics considers that the slow variables are conserved quantities (mass, momentum and energy) only, and describe these slow motions,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \rho + \partial_a \rho v_a &= 0 \\ \partial_t \rho v_a + \partial_b \rho v_a v_b = \partial_b \sigma'_{ab} \ \sigma'_{ab} &= -P\delta_{ab} + B_{abcd}\partial_c v_d + s_{ab} \\ \partial_t e + \partial_a J_a = 0, \ J_a &= e v_a - \sigma'_{ab} v_b - \kappa \partial_a T - g_a. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The currents of momentum and those of energy include two parts: reversible parts expressed by thermodynamics and irreversible parts expressed by the linear irreversible thermodynamics and thermal fluctuations. Mass density evolutions need no dissipation thus do not include the irreversible part. The set of equations has many coefficients, so we first explain the ordinary deterministic ones. (P, T) express pressure and temperature and are the functions of mass density and internal energy density $(\rho, e - \rho v^2/2)$. Linear irreversible processes have two coefficients κ, B. κ is heat conductivity. B is the coefficient

of viscous stress. It takes the following form for isotropic homogeneous materials satisfying Stokes hypothesis,

$$B_{abce} = \zeta(\delta_{ac}\delta_{be} + \delta_{ae}\delta_{bc} - 2d^{-1}\delta_{ab}\delta_{ce}). \tag{6}$$

ζ is shear viscosity and d expresses the dimension of systems here. Then we explain the stochastic one that is a characteristic feature of fluctuating hydrodynamic equations. (s, g) are random stress and random heat current. Thermal fluctuations are governed by fluctuation dissipation relation (FDR) [3] and this formulation stochastically describes the fluctuations. (s, g) can be written by the white noises as a consequence of the central limit theorem, thus they satisfy the following relations of local FDR, using $\langle\rangle$ as the noise average,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle s_{ab}(x,t)s_{cd}(x',t')\rangle &= 2B_{abcd}T\delta(x-x')\delta(t-t')\\ \langle g_a(x,t)g_b(x',t')\rangle &= 2\kappa T^2\delta_{ab}\delta(x-x')\delta(t-t')\\ \langle s_a(x,t)g_a(x',t')\rangle &= 0.\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The tensor of right hand side of the random shear case corresponds to the coefficient tensor of viscosity as a result of FDR. In addition, the high wave number cutoff Λ is assumed to reflect the non-continuum area of short-wavelength.

Here we want to include the effect of the elastic order. Previous formulations (5) are not sufficient for solid systems because there is rigidity that is caused by the elastic order [24, 26]. So we must define the strain first. According to the Lagrangian description, a unit of continuity accumulates the strain as a consequence of the velocity difference from the environment (other units surrounding the unit). It can be formulated as follows,

$$\frac{D\epsilon_{ab}}{Dt} = \partial_a v_b. \tag{8}$$

Here $D/Dt := \partial_t + v_a\partial_a$ is Lagrangian differentiation. Now we do not symmetrize the strain for the simple appearance. Then elastic order yields the Hookean response to the strain,

$$\sigma^{el}_{ab}(\epsilon) = C_{abcd}\epsilon_{cd}. \tag{9}$$

C is the coefficient of elastic stress. The existence of the elastic order is the reason why the traceless part of strain explicitly affects the motions of conserved quantities although it is not conserved. Some previous studies include the additional dissipative parts on the evolution of strain (8) to represent the vacancy diffusions [26]. However, flow law of such transport is known to be much more nonlinear like Arrhenius behaviors and much slow [28]. Here we do not consider such quite slow ductile motions of solids negligible in the time-scales of our interest, and assume this strain time evolution (8) is the exact form (thus no dissipation) like that of mass density, as already the other previous studies did [24].

Then, one must be careful with the dependence between volumetric strain ϵ_{aa} and mass density ρ when he solves the couplings. The two quantities are connected by the following relation,

$$\frac{D}{Dt}[\log\rho + \epsilon_{aa}] = 0. \tag{10}$$

It means that the volumetric strain is the same with logarithmic mass density change, in a rough sense. This can be derived from (5) and (8). Thus the description of the response to the volumetric strain is not formally unique, even though it is a mere formal aspect. This reason is obvious because the elastic order intrinsically yields only the rigidity (elastic shear response only) [1]. Elastic volumetric stress is the consequence of mass conservation. Here we take a rule to eliminate this indefiniteness of formalism that volumetric change is totally written by mass density ρ. In this rule, elastic order effect of rigidity is purely described as $\sigma'^{el}(\epsilon) := \sigma^{el}(\epsilon - \epsilon_{aa}I)$. As another note, the coupling yields the dependence of phenomenological constants of two stresses (σ', σ'^{el}) on conserved quantities and the traceless strain.

Based on the above discussions, assuming the additivity of the stress caused by conserved quantities and the stress caused by elastic orders $(\sigma = \sigma' + \sigma'^{el})$, we get the following equations

$$\begin{aligned}\partial_t\rho + \partial_a\rho v_a &= 0\\ \partial_t\rho v_a + \partial_b\rho v_a v_b &= \partial_b\sigma_{ab}\\ \partial_t e + \partial_a J_a &= 0,\ J_a = ev_a - \sigma_{ab}v_b - \kappa\partial_a T - g_a\\ (\partial_t + v_c\partial_c)\epsilon_{ab} &= \partial_a v_b\\ \sigma_{ab} &= -P\delta_{ab} + C_{abcd}(\epsilon_{cd} - \delta_{cd}\epsilon_{ff})\\ &\quad + B_{abcd}\partial_c v_d + s_{ab}.\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

This is the explicit form of fluctuating elastic equations. Actually, this takes the same form with that derived from the thermodynamic discussions in one dimension [26], neglecting their vacancy diffusion terms. We start the analysis based on this set of equations. Following discussion is focused on the case of uniform isotropic elasticity $(C_{abcd} = \lambda\delta_{ab}\delta_{cd} + \mu(\delta_{ac}\delta_{bd} + \delta_{ad}\delta_{bc}))$ for simplicity. We also introduce the displacement field ψ for the analytical simplicity and the strain is expressed as $\epsilon_{ab} = \partial_a\psi_b$. We now set the reference value of ψ at 0.

Next, we want to derive a simple model from (11) appropriate for our purpose. According to the previous understandings, the thermal fluctuations of conserved quantities yield the anomalous transport through the nonlinearity of streaming terms [6, 7]. Then the concrete value of the contributions into transportation coefficients by the nonlinear coupling can be derived from the analysis of fluctuating motions around some equilibrium states [3, 7, 10]. So we consider the dynamics of fluctuations around an equilibrium state $(\rho, v, e, \epsilon) = (\rho_0, 0, e_0, \mathbf{0})$. Here we use 0 as the index of corresponding values in original states ($A_0 := \langle A\rangle$ for a variable A). Also, our interest is in the change caused by the inclusion of rigidity, thus the perturbative treatment of it suits our purpose. We consider the effect of rigidity

in the perturbative way and neglect the related nonlinearity ($C \simeq C_0, (-PI + \sigma'^{el})\mathbf{v} \simeq -P\mathbf{v}$). The effect of nonlinearity on the evolution of strain to the dynamics of conserved quantities is also negligible at the same time. Even in the accurate treatment, the linear order (in particular, the poles of the Green function) does not change, so this neglect does not lack the intrinsic physics. In addition, dissipative nonlinearity is known to be irrelevant around the fixed points of our interest [29], hence we also neglect them ($(B, \kappa, \sigma' v) \simeq (B_0, \kappa_0, -Pv)$). Under these settings, original equations (11) are translated into the followings,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \rho + \partial_a \rho v_a = 0,\ \partial_t \psi_a = v_a \\
\partial_t \rho v_a + \partial_b \rho v_a v_b = -\partial_a \delta P + C_{0abcd}\partial_b[\partial_c \psi_d - \delta_{cd}\partial_f \psi_f] \\
+ B_{0abcd}\partial_b \partial_c v_d + \partial_b s_{0ab} \qquad (12) \\
\partial_t e + \partial_a (h_0 + \delta e + \delta P) v_a = D_0 \Delta e + E_0 \Delta \rho + \partial_a g_{0a}.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used δ as the index of the fluctuations ($\delta A := A - \langle A \rangle$ for a variable A) and defined $h_0 := e_0 + P_0, D_0 := \kappa_0(\partial T/\partial e)_0, E_0 := \kappa_0(\partial T/\partial \rho)_0$. Around 0 strain states, the dependence of temperature on traceless strain starts from the second order of fluctuations (because the dependence comes from the internal energy or the second, third invariance of stress by the requirement of coordinate transformation invariance), so negligible in this case.

Then equations are drastically reduced, thus the analysis can be done with some given pressure fluctuation property. Here we consider the incompressible cases (adiabatic elimination of pressure fluctuations) as the representative model of them. It is the purpose here to study the effect of rigidity against the classic model of the anomaly [7]. The decoupling hypothesis between heat mode and sound modes proposed in [29] naturally follows this setting. Under the situation of the incompressible case ($\delta\rho = 0$), the model (12) with (6) is reduced to the followings,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \psi_a = v_a,\ \partial_a v_a = 0 \\
\partial_t v_a + \partial_b v_a v_b = -\partial_a \delta p + Y_0 \Delta \psi_a + \nu_0 \Delta v_a + \partial_b s'_{0ab} \\
\partial_t \delta e + \partial_a (\delta e + \rho_0 \delta p) v_a = D \Delta \delta e + \partial_a g_{0a}. \qquad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

$\nu_0 := \zeta_0/\rho_0$ is kinetic viscosity. We also defined $p := P/\rho, Y := \mu/\rho, s' := s/\rho_0$. This is the minimal model to study the effect of rigidity against the classic result of the anomlous heat conduction [7], thus our following analysis is based on this equation.

Also, as a simple model comparable with another previous work [20], we construct another. With approximations appropriate for lattice models ($(\delta\rho/\rho_0)/(\delta e/e_0) \ll 1$) we consider the situations of small pressure fluctuations. Then translation of the base in the model (12) as $(\rho, v, e, \epsilon) = (\rho_0, 0, e_0, 0) \to (\rho, u, e, \epsilon) = (\rho_0, 0, e_0, 0), u := \rho v$ with $B_{abcd} = \zeta(\delta_{ac}\delta_{be} + \delta_{ad}\delta_{bc} - \delta_{ab}\delta_{cd})$(for remaining the viscosity even in $d = 1$ and for treating $d = 2$ as the zero bulk viscosity case (6)) yields the following tractable form,

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_t \delta\rho + \partial_a u_a = 0,\ \partial_t \psi_a = u_a/\rho_0 \\
\partial_t u_a + \rho_0^{-1}\partial_b u_a u_b = -\left(\left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial \rho}\right)_0 - \mu_0/\rho_0\right)\delta\rho \\
- \left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial e}\right)_0 \delta e + \mu_0 \Delta \psi_a + \zeta_0 \Delta v_a + \partial_b s_{ab} \qquad (14) \\
\partial_t \delta e + \rho_0^{-1}\partial_a (h_0 + \delta e + \delta P) u_a = D\Delta\delta e + E\Delta\delta\rho + \partial_a g_a.
\end{aligned}$$

This is equivalent to the noisy Burgers model [7] with elastic terms, though the noise properties are slightly different at $d \neq 1$ because of the existing FDR. Also, this is equivalent with the noisy Burgers added linear pressure fluctuations at $d = 1$ which already studied in [20]. If one chooses the parameter $(\partial P/\partial\rho)_0 = \mu_0/\rho_0$, this is a natural generalization of it to any dimensions. This model is easily analyzed with decoupling hypothesis [29], corresponding to $(\partial P/\partial e)_0 = 0$ in this model. At the time when the hypothesis holds, one finds this elastic Burgers model has the same solution of renormalized heat diffusion coefficient with that of passive scalars. This model, furthermore, can be used even in $d = 1$ and clarify the same formal structures of the recovery. However, its analysis is slightly complicated and masks the intrinsic difference between $d > 1$ and $d = 1$ as seen in later. These models (13), (14) have mostly the same behavior in $d > 1$ (anomaly cut-off by rigidity in heat diffusion) and the analysis of $d = 1$ is already done in [20] (their MCT results in which are accurate), so we consistently show the results of incompressible cases (13) in the next section for simplicity.

III. RESULT

In this section, we show the recovery of Fourier's law (saturation of the anomalous heat conduction) at the long wavelength limit based on the fluctuating elastic equations of incompressible cases under the perturbative treatments of rigidity (13). As the consequence, it is clarified that the rigidity is the intrinsic factor for the recovery of Fourier's law in low dimensional momentum-conserving systems (except $d = 1$ in the strict meaning). We now study the same discussion with previous studies [6, 7, 25] and check the effect of elastic orders to the observed transportation coefficients.

We start the analysis based on model equations (13). We first eliminate the change of strain as the integrals of velocity using Fourier transform $f(\mathbf{k}, \omega) = \int d\mathbf{x}dt \exp(i(\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{x} + \omega t)) f(\mathbf{x}, t)$, and also eliminate pressure by incompressible conditions. After eliminations, the original equations are reduced to

$$\begin{aligned}
v_a = G\hat{f}_a - i\lambda G P_{abc}(v_b * v_c) \qquad (15) \\
\delta e = gf' - i\lambda g k_a [v_a * (\delta e + \rho_0 \delta p)] \qquad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
G = \left(i\omega + (\nu_0 - iY_0/\omega)k^2\right)^{-1} \\
g = (i\omega + \kappa_0 k^2)^{-1} \qquad (17) \\
\delta p = -k^{-2}[ik_c f_c + k_b k_c \lambda (v_b * v_c)].
\end{aligned}$$

Here we defined $P_{ab}(\mathbf{k}) = \delta_{ab} - k_a k_b/k^2, P_{abc} := (P_{ab}k_c + P_{ac}k_b)/2$ as ordinary defined and the formal nonlinear intensity factor λ is introduced [7], which expresses the smallness of fluctuations. $(a * b)(\mathbf{k}, \omega) := \int d\mathbf{q} d\Omega a(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{q}, \omega - \Omega) b(\mathbf{q}, \Omega)$ is the convolution. Noises were rewritten as $f_a := \partial_b s_{0ab}/\rho_0, \hat{f}_a := P_{ab} f_b, f' := \partial_a g_a$. Particularly, the noise $\hat{f}_a$ governs the renormalizations and has the following properties

$$\langle \hat{f}_a(\mathbf{k}, t) \hat{f}_b(\mathbf{k}', t') \rangle = \frac{\Sigma_0 k^2 P_{ab}(\mathbf{k})}{(2\pi)^{d+1}} \delta(\mathbf{k} + \mathbf{k}') \delta(t + t'), \quad \Sigma_0 := 2\rho_0^{-1} \nu_0 T_0. \tag{18}$$

The projection on the incompressible motions P changes the noise property of $\hat{f}$ to the solenoidal. It is actually derived based on Stokes hypothesis (6) in our case.

Before the details, we note the procedure and some allowed shortcuts to our analysis. Based on these equations, in some rough sense, we can get the observed (renormalized) transportation coefficients of the corresponding sizes after the elimination of shorter wavelength thermal noises. Though the just above statement is slightly inaccurate because the size dependence is intrinsically determined not by the cutoff sizes but by the cutoff time-scales, this difference becomes a problem only when one wants to determine the exponent [10]. Our interest is now focused on the rougher problem, whether the observed coefficients of large scales remain finite or not. Thus, this difference is not the case for our purpose. Also, there is another shortcut of analysis because of the crudeness of our interest. One needs the iteration of renormalization (i.e. RG) to adjust the change of base coefficients through the determination process of the divergence exponents, but this iteration is not needed to know whether the coefficients diverge or not [7]. Thus, just a renormalization (MCT) is sufficient for our purpose.

We evaluate this renormalization (MCT) concretely and discuss whether the divergence exists. For this purpose, we consider the contributions from short wavelength to the long wavelength by some perturbations. The key of the analysis is the exact treatment of the long wavelength through the analysis [7]. As done in the previous works, we set a wavelength Λe^{-l} and consider the longer wavelength variables $(v^<, \delta e^<) := (v, \delta e)\theta(\Lambda e^{-l} - k)$ and the shorter wavelength ones $(v^>, \delta e^>) := (v - v^<, \delta e - \delta e^<)$. A limit $l \to 0$ corresponds to the thermodynamic limit. We evaluate the contributions from the shorter side to the longer side in the perturbative way by two procedures: expansions of the shorter wavelength variables about the formal nonlinear intensity factor λ and the insertion of it to the longer side. We write the expansion as $(v^>, \delta e^>) = \sum_n \lambda^n (v^{>(n)}, \delta e^{>(n)})$. $(v^>, \delta e^>)$ is now determined as a function of $(v^<, \delta e^<)$. Also as a result of the insertion, one finds that the perturbed equation of the longer side takes the same form with the expansion of the shorter side as $(v, \delta e)^{>(n)} = ((v, \delta e)^{(n)})^>, (v, \delta e)^{<(n)} = ((v, \delta e)^{(n)})^<$, $(v^<, \delta e^<) = \sum_n \lambda^n (v^{<(n)}, \delta e^{<(n)})$. The expansion and the insertion are successively determined. For example, one gets the expansions up to the second order as

$$v_a^{(0)} = G \hat{f}_a \tag{19}$$

$$v_a^{(1)} = -iGP_{abc}[(v_b^{>(0)} + v_b^<) * (v_c^{>(0)} + v_c^<)] \tag{20}$$

$$v_a^{(2)} = -2iGP_{abc}[(v_b^{>(0)} + v_b^<) * v_c^{>(1)}] \tag{21}$$

and

$$\delta e^{(0)} = g f' \tag{22}$$

$$\delta e^{(1)} = -igk_a\{(v_a^< + v_a^{>(0)}) * [\delta e^< + \delta e^{>(0)} + \rho_0(\delta p^< + \delta p^{>(0)})]\} \tag{23}$$

$$\delta e^{(2)} = -igk_a\{(v_a^< + v_a^{>(0)}) * (\delta e^{>(1)} + \rho_0 \delta p^{>(1)}) + v_a^{>(1)} * [\delta e^< + \delta e^{>(0)} + \rho_0(\delta p^< + \delta p^{>(0)})]\}. \tag{24}$$

The 0th base reflects the original dynamics driven by thermal noises and the 1st order includes two parts: original dynamics of streaming terms and the renormalization of thermal fluctuations. The 2nd order yields the renormalization into transportation coefficients and enthalpy fluctuations. The third order corresponds to the renormalization into the nonlinearity, but is known to be canceled out [7, 10, 26]. Here our interest is the renormalization into transportation coefficients, so we evaluate it concretely.

Each renormalization is executed by the absorption of finite perturbations came from the elimination of short wavelength thermal fluctuations (i.e. noise average of short wavelength $\langle\rangle_>$) into the corresponding terms. Thus the perturbation order is $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{2n})$, $(, n = 1, 2, ...)$. The lowest renormalization into transportation coefficients comes from $v^{(2)}$, $e^{(2)}$ (21), (24) as

$$\langle v_a^{<(2)} \rangle_> = -4GP_{abc}[(\sigma^> P_{be}) * (G^> P_{cde})] v_d^< + \mathcal{O}(v^{<3}) \tag{25}$$

$$\langle \delta e^{<(2)} \rangle_> = -gk_a[(\sigma^> P_{ab}) * (g^> k_b)] \delta e^< + \mathcal{O}(\delta p^<, (v^<)^3, \delta e (v^<)^2) \tag{26}$$

$$\sigma := \langle v_a^{(0)} v_b^{(0)} \rangle / (P_{ab} \delta(k + k') \delta(\omega + \omega')) = |G|^2 k^2. \tag{27}$$

$\mathcal{O}(\delta p^<)$ terms are renormalized into the pressure fluctuation term of the energy currents and is out of our interest. Cubic fluctuations are irrelevant terms thus negligible. We note that it is convenient for the derivation to use the fact $\langle v^{(0)} * v^{(0)} \rangle, \langle \delta e^{(0)} * \delta e^{(0)} \rangle \propto \delta(k), \langle v^{(1)} \rangle_> = \mathcal{O}((v^<)^2), \langle \delta e^{(1)} \rangle_> = \mathcal{O}((v^<)^2, v^< \delta e^<)$.

Hence the concrete calculation of convolutions in (25), (26) is the left task for us. The RG flow is strongly governed by the lowest order perturbations [7] (because RG flow takes the $l \to 0$ limit for each iteration thus higher order contributions vanish). Therefore, this evaluation of the lowest order perturbation (25), (26) well approximates the exact result. On the calculations, one finds the intrinsic role of rigidity for the anomaly cutoff, the change of poles by rigidity in velocity fields.

First we calculate the renormalization into viscosity (25). Defining the $\mathbf{q}^{\pm} := \mathbf{q} \pm \mathbf{k}/2$, $\sqrt{}(q) := \sqrt{-\nu_0^2 q^4/4 + Y_0 q^2}$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(\sigma^{>} P_{be}) * (G^{>} P_{cfe}) \qquad (28)\\
&= \int_{\Lambda > q^{\pm} > \Lambda e^{-l}} d\mathbf{q} \frac{\Sigma_0}{(2\pi)^d} P_{be}(\mathbf{q}^+)(q^+)^2 P_{cfe}(-\mathbf{q}^-) F\\
&F := \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} |G|^2(\mathbf{q}^+, \Omega) G(-\mathbf{q}^-, \omega - \Omega)\\
&= i \sum_{\pm} \mathrm{Res}[|G|^2(\mathbf{q}^+, \Omega) G(-\mathbf{q}^-, \omega - \Omega),\\
&\Omega = \frac{i\nu_0 (q^+)^2}{2} \pm \sqrt{}(q^+)]. \qquad (29)
\end{aligned}
$$

Our interest is in the long wavelength behavior and the singularity is actually seen only there, therefore we can expand F about (ω, k). Following it, we calculate the perturbation of F about (ω, k). Using

$$
\begin{aligned}
&G^*(\mathbf{q}^+, \frac{i\nu_0 (q^+)^2}{2} \pm \sqrt{}(q^+)) = (2\nu_0 (q^+)^2)^{-1} \qquad (30)\\
&G^*(\mathbf{q}^-, \omega - \frac{i\nu_0 (q^+)^2}{2} \mp \sqrt{}(q^+)) = (2\nu_0 q^2)^{-1}\\
&\quad \times \left[1 + \frac{\omega \mp \partial_{\mathbf{q}} \sqrt{} \cdot \mathbf{k}}{i\nu_0 q^2} + \frac{\omega - i\nu_0 \mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{k} \mp \partial_{\mathbf{q}} \sqrt{} \cdot \mathbf{k}}{-i\nu_0 q^2 \mp 2\sqrt{}} \right]\\
&\quad + \mathcal{O}(\omega^2, \omega k, k^2) \qquad (31)\\
&\frac{i\nu_0 (q^+)^2/2 + \pm\sqrt{}(q^+)}{\pm 2\sqrt{}(q^+)} = \frac{\sqrt{} \pm i\nu_0 q^2/2}{2\sqrt{}} \qquad (32)\\
&\quad \times \left(1 - \frac{\partial_{\mathbf{q}} \sqrt{} \cdot \mathbf{k}}{2\sqrt{}} + \frac{\partial_{\mathbf{q}} \sqrt{} \cdot \mathbf{k} \pm i\nu_0 \mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{k}}{2\sqrt{} \pm i\nu_0 q^2} + \mathcal{O}(k^2) \right),
\end{aligned}
$$

we get

$$
(q^+)^2 F = \frac{1}{4\nu_0 q^2} (1 + \omega/(i\nu_0 q^2) + \mathcal{O}(k^2, \omega k, k^2)). \qquad (33)
$$

Finally, inserting (33) to (28), the symmetry of integration area cancels the terms of $\mathcal{O}(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ out, and we get the followings,

$$
\begin{aligned}
&(\sigma^{>} P_{be}) * (G^{>} P_{cfe})\\
&= \int_{\Lambda > q^{\pm} > \Lambda e^{-l}} d\mathbf{q} \frac{\Sigma_0}{(2\pi)^d} P_{be}(\mathbf{q}^+) P_{cfe}(-\mathbf{q}^-) \frac{1}{4\nu_0 q^2}\\
&\quad + \mathcal{O}(k^2, \omega k)\\
&= \int_{\Lambda > q > \Lambda e^{-l}} d\mathbf{q} \frac{\Sigma_0}{(2\pi)^d} P_{be}(\mathbf{q}^+) P_{cfe}(-\mathbf{q}^-) \frac{1}{4\nu_0 q^2}\\
&\quad + \mathcal{O}(k^2, \omega k). \qquad (34)
\end{aligned}
$$

This is just the same result with that of the incompressible fluids [7]. Hence rigidity is irrelevant for the renormalization into viscosity ν at least in this setting. Executing the directional integration of (34), inserting it to (25) and renormalizing the finite perturbations into the kinetic viscosity, one arrives at the following [7],

$$
\begin{aligned}
\nu_R/\nu_0 &= 1 + \frac{\lambda_0^2 \Sigma_0}{2\nu_0^3} \frac{d^2 - 2}{d^2 + 2d} \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{d/2} \Gamma(d/2)}\\
&\quad \times \int_{\Lambda e^{-l}}^{\Lambda} dq q^{d-3} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^4, k, \omega)\\
&\to \infty \ (d \le 2, l \to 0). \qquad (35)
\end{aligned}
$$

Here we used R as the index of renormalized values of the correspoding coefficients. It means the divergence of observed viscosity in the thermodynamic limit of low dimensional systems as already believed.

On the other hand, the renormalization into heat conductivity is largely changed by the inclusion of rigidity. The renormalization of heat diffusion coefficients corresponds to the δe-proportional terms in (26). The coefficient is evaluated as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[(\sigma^{>} P_{ab}) * (g^{>} k_b)]\\
&= \int_{\Lambda > q^{\pm} > \Lambda e^{-l}} d\mathbf{q} \frac{\Sigma_0}{(2\pi)^d} (q^+)^2 P_{ab}(\mathbf{q}^+)(-q_b^-) F' \qquad (36)\\
&F' := \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} |G|^2(\mathbf{q}^+, \Omega) g(-\mathbf{q}^-, \omega - \Omega) \qquad (37)\\
&= i \mathrm{Res}[|G|^2(\mathbf{q}^+, \Omega) g(-\mathbf{q}^-, \omega - \Omega)\\
&\quad , \Omega = \frac{i\nu_0 (q^+)^2}{2} \pm \sqrt{}(q^+)]. \qquad (38)
\end{aligned}
$$

The difference made by nonzero rigidity is the change of poles of velocity fields. Because of this change, the poles of velocity never coincide with those of energy anymore. This difference of poles (physically corresponding to the difference whether they have restoring forces or not) makes difference of the results. Then we continue the same calculation with the case of viscosity. Noticing $P_{ab}(\mathbf{q}^+)(-q_b^-) = P_{ab}(\mathbf{q}^+) k_b$, the expansion is easily done. Using

$$
\begin{aligned}
F' &= (2\nu_0 (q^+)^2)^{-1} \sum_{\pm} \frac{\sqrt{} \pm i\nu_0 q^2/2}{2\sqrt{}} \frac{1}{\nu_0 q^2/2 \mp i\sqrt{} + D_0 q^2}\\
&\quad + \mathcal{O}(\omega, k), \qquad (39)
\end{aligned}
$$

we arrive at

$$
\begin{aligned}
&[(\sigma^{>} P_{ab}) * (g^{>} k_b)]\\
&= k_b \int_{\Lambda > q > \Lambda e^{-l}} d\mathbf{q} \frac{\Sigma_0 P_{ab}}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{2\nu_0} \frac{D_0}{D_0(\nu_0 + D_0) q^2 + Y_0}\\
&\quad + \mathcal{O}(\omega k, k^2)\\
&= k_a \Delta D/\lambda^2. \qquad (40)
\end{aligned}
$$

We defined ΔD as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta D &:= \frac{\lambda^2 \Sigma_0 D_0 (d-1)}{2(2\sqrt{\pi})^d \Gamma(d/2+1) \nu_0}\\
&\quad \times \int_{\Lambda e^{-l}}^{\Lambda} dq \frac{q^{d-1}}{D_0(\nu_0 + D_0) q^2 + Y_0} + \mathcal{O}(\omega, k) \qquad (41)
\end{aligned}
$$

Obviously, rigidity ($Y_0 = \mu_0/\rho_0$) yields the cutoff of the anomalous heat conduction. The cutoff actually exists

at the wavenumber where the restoring force begins to dominate the velocity field Green function (17). Renormalizing this finite perturbation into the heat diffusion coefficient D in (26), schematically $(g^{-1}+\Delta D k^2)\delta e^{<} \simeq g^{-1}(\delta e^{<(0)}+\lambda\delta e^{<(1)}+\mathcal{O}(\delta p^{<}))$, one gets

$$D_R/D_0 = 1+\Delta D/D_0+\mathcal{O}(\lambda^4). \tag{42}$$

Finally, the size dependence of specific heat is negligibly small because the value of it is determined by equilibrium statistical mechanics. Thus renormalized heat conductivity takes the form

$$\begin{aligned}\kappa_R/\kappa_0 = D_R/D_0 &= 1+\frac{\lambda^2\Sigma_0(d-1)}{2(2\sqrt{\pi})^d\Gamma(d/2+1)\nu_0}\\ &\times\int_{\Lambda e^{-l}}^{\Lambda} dq\frac{q^{d-1}}{D_0(\nu_0+D_0)q^2+Y_0}+\mathcal{O}(\lambda^4,\omega,k)\\ &<\infty\ \ (Y_0>0,\, l\to 0).\end{aligned} \tag{43}$$

Obviously, this result demonstrates the anomaly cutoff caused by rigidity. The renormalized value of heat conductivity restore the well-known result of incompressible fluids [7] at the zero rigidity limit $Y_0=\mu_0/\rho_0\to 0, \lim_{l\to 0}\kappa_R\to\infty$. This means that we get the same result at $\Lambda e^{-l}\gg\sqrt{Y_0/(\nu_0+\kappa_0)}$ with the case of incompressible fluids. Because of this coincidence, combining the renormalization group analysis [7, 10], we get the following rough expression,

$$\kappa(N)\sim(\min[N,N_*])^{\alpha}. \tag{44}$$

We defined the characteristic system size of balance between dissipation shear stress and elastic one N_* *s.t.*

$$N_*\sim\sqrt{\frac{\nu(N_*)+\kappa(N_*)}{Y_0}}, \tag{45}$$

as done for $d=1$ in [20]. The recovery of Fourier's law occurs at large sizes where the restoring force dominates the motion. It asserts the rigidity-induced recovery of Fourier's law is the universal behavior in the low dimensional systems of elastic orders.

For the last of the analysis, we point out the mistake of the renormalization evaluation into the noise coefficient of random shear stress in [20]. This point is also discussed in the next section (also see *Appendix*). Their calculation breaks the FDR after the renormalization and it becomes the driving force to a nontrivial fixed point they (wrongly) found (ballistic fixed point in their terminology). However, one can find it is a mistake if one repeats the calculations, although their MCT evaluations of transportation coefficients were accurate. As seen in our analysis, the origin of the cutoff comes not from the broken FDR but from the breakdown of the hyper-scaling between viscosity and heat conductivity. Actually, viscosity diverges even in our calculation and theirs [20]. This is caused by the long-range restoring force of elasticity. On the numerical structures, intrinsic point is formally written as $G_0=i\omega+\nu_0 k^2\to i\omega+[\nu_0+\mu_0/(i\omega)]k^2$ in the velocity field Green function. The incompressible cases (37) actually demonstrates the universal structure of the competition of restoring forces and dissipative forces, because the frequency integral which determines the cutoff is independent of dimensions. One can get the same structure in the generalized Burgers model (14) (see [20] for the details of $d=1$). Most of fluids has no rigidity thus their vortexes (rotational motions) have no restoring forces in the linear order. Hence, in general, it needs rigidity to get the strong restoring forces in $d>1$, which can cause the recovery of Fourier's law in our analysis. On the point that long range interactions cut off the massless behavior of systems, this phenomenon may be compared with the Anderson Higgs mechanisms of superconductivity caused by electromagnetism [30].

By the same reason, we can conclude that the recovery of Fourier's law by pressure fluctuations [20] was caused by the vanishment of shear stress in one dimensional systems. The intrinsic physics of this recovery is the competition of dissipations with reversible restoring forces and the competition unavoidably occurs in $d=1$. We repeat their results were accurate in the MCT analysis of transportation coefficients. Higher dimensions than one have shear-directional dissipations but one dimensional cases do not have them. In other words, dissipative momentum transport must compete with conservative mass fluctuations in $d=1$. This explains why the fluidic systems show the recovery in $d=1$. The situation of the recovery is therefore universal, but the physics needed to cause this recovery is almost completely different between $d>1$ and $d=1$. Elastic orders are needed to recover Fourier's law in two dimensional cases, but one dimensional cases unaboidably show the recovery of Fourier's law by the fluctuations of conserved quantities.

IV. DISCUSSION

At the last, we discuss the correspondence of our results with previous works. First, we discuss correspondence with [10, 26] where they claimed the existence of the nontrivial fixed point showing anomalous heat conduction. One considered also the elastic effects, though limited in one dimension [26]. These analyses commonly studied the possible scaling of transportation coefficients, but they did not consider the improbable breakdown of the hyper-scalings. Our findings are just such breakdowns. Rigidity actually brings the systems the change of poles in Green functions of velocity fields resulting in the hyper-scaling breakdown. If one wants the detailed RG analysis, the unstable behavior of fixed points sustaining the hyper-scaling would be a significant point.

To demonstrate such RG analysis, we study the RG flow of the case of incompressible fluctuating elasticity we studied here for $d>1$ and the model in [20] for $d=1$ with appropriate corrections. We choose the passive scalar limit in both cases for simplicity, which corresponds to $\rho_0\to 0$ in incompressible cases (13). The RG flow is

constructed of the iteration of two processes: the renormalization of a quite thin spherical shell of wavenumber ($l \to 0$) and the rescaling of the base equations [7]. We can more accurately determine the asymptotes with the change of base states in the renormalization procedure than the case without such changes. Fortunately, we can reuse the result of MCT in the renormalization process. The loop order corresponds to the order of eliminated shell thickness Λl in this translation. Then MCT gives the good result for the absorption in each iteration. The renormalization into the noises Σ is slightly complicated, but with similar procedures, one finds it takes the same form with incompressible cases [7] (see *Appendix*). Then we compress the length scales as $k \to k' := ke^l$ to keep the total sphere diameter as Λ after the elimination of the shell $\Lambda e^{-l} < k < \Lambda$, and the time scale as $\omega \to \omega' := \omega \exp(\int dl z(l))$ to keep the characteristic time scale of dissipation at Λ. The variables $(v, \delta e)$ are also rescaled to keep the characteristic intensity (temperature) as $(v, \delta e) \to (v', \delta e') := (v, \delta e)\exp(-\int dl(z + d/2))$. These rescales modify the substantial values of coefficients e.g. $(\nu, \Sigma, D) \to (\nu, \Sigma, D)\exp(\int dl(z-2))$. Combining the renormalization and taking the limit $l \to 0$, one gets,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\nu}{dl} &= \nu(z - 2 + A_d\bar{\lambda}^2) \\
\frac{d\Sigma}{dl} &= \Sigma(z - 2 + A_d\bar{\lambda}^2) \\
\frac{d\lambda}{dl} &= \lambda(z - 1 - d/2) \\
\frac{dY}{dl} &= Y(2z - 2) \\
\frac{dD}{dl} &= D\left(z - 2 + \frac{(d-1)\tilde{K}_d}{\bar{\kappa}(1+\bar{\kappa}) + \bar{Y}}\bar{\lambda}^2\right).
\end{aligned}
\tag{46}
$$

$\bar{\lambda} := \lambda\sqrt{\Sigma\Lambda^{d-2}/\nu^3}, \bar{Y} := Y/(\nu\Lambda)^2, \bar{\kappa} := \kappa(\partial P/\partial e)_\rho/\nu$ are nondimensionalized coefficients. We defined

$$
A_d := \frac{d^2 - 2}{(d^2 + 2d)(2\sqrt{\pi})^d\Gamma(d/2)} \tag{47}
$$

$$
\tilde{K}_d := (2(2\sqrt{\pi})^d\Gamma(d/2 + 1))^{-1}, \tag{48}
$$

as done in [7]. $\tilde{K}_d$ is slightly different from theirs (K_d/d in their terminology) about the factor 2, but this is subtle for our discussions so we do not discuss it here. λ^2 parts correspond to the renormalizations and the others correspond to the effects of rescalings. This derivation looks to be limited in $l \ll 1$, but we can reuse this derivation to $l \geq 1$ interpreting $l \to \Delta l$ in each renormalization and rescaling procedure through the iteration $l = \sum \Delta l$. Thus the equations exactly describe the renormalization even for the finite perturbations $l \geq 1$. z is chosen ν to be fixed at the initial value as $z = 2 - A_d\bar{\lambda}^2$. Thus the flow is reduced to

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\bar{\lambda}}{dl} &= \bar{\lambda}(1 - d/2 - A_d\bar{\lambda}^2) \\
\frac{d\bar{Y}}{dl} &= \bar{Y}(2 - 2A_d\bar{\lambda}^2) \\
\frac{d\bar{\kappa}}{dl} &= \bar{\kappa}\bar{\lambda}^2\left(-A_d + \frac{(d-1)\tilde{K}_d}{\bar{\kappa}(1+\bar{\kappa}) + \bar{Y}}\right).
\end{aligned}
\tag{49}
$$

This is the RG flow of the equations (13). The value of $\bar{\kappa}$ expresses the ratio between κ and ν because the system size dependence of heat capacity is negligible. In $d < \sqrt{2}$, this flow does not have the nontrivial fixed point with real $\bar{\lambda}$ value, thus cannot work to predict anomalous transports seen in the simulations at $d = 1$. This would reflect the integrable behavior, i.e. rigid body behavior, in one dimensional incompressible systems. So we focus the analysis on $\sqrt{2} < d \leq 2$ to study the anomaly. Our purpose is to study this flow's stable fixed point which dominates the behavior of large systems. In $d < 2$, this can be easily analyzed, because $\bar{\lambda}$ is independent of the other values and shows the exponentially fast convergence to the stable fixed point $\bar{\lambda}_* := \sqrt{(1 - d/2)/A_d}$. Therefore, we can safely replace $\bar{\lambda}$ with the value $\bar{\lambda}_*$ at sufficiently large sizes $l \gg 1$. The trivial fixed point $\bar{\lambda} = 0$ is unstable in $d < 2$ and we start the renormalization with $\lambda > 0$, thus $\bar{\lambda}$ is swallowed into the stable fixed point at $l \gg 1$. At $\lambda = \lambda_*$, it has two typical behaviors. One is the stable fixed point for zero rigidity limit $\bar{Y} \to 0$, rewriting heat capacity $(\partial T/\partial e)_\rho$ as c_T,

$$
(\mu/(\zeta\Lambda)^2, \kappa c_T/\nu) = (0, const(> 0)). \tag{50}
$$

This is the well-known fixed point of anomalous heat conduction [7]. Using $(d-1)\tilde{K}_d/A_d \gg 1$, we can roughly estimate the constant as $\bar{\kappa} \sim \sqrt{(d-1)\tilde{K}_d/A_d}$. However, with nonzero rigidity, it becomes an unstable fixed point, because $\bar{Y}$ exponentially grows up $\bar{Y} \sim \bar{Y}_0 e^{dl}$ at $l \gg 1$ (because $2 - 2A_d\bar{\lambda}^2 \sim d$) and the second term in the flow of $\bar{\kappa}$ is eliminated because of the growth. The truly stable fixed point is thus the one of the hyper-scaling breakdown,

$$
(\mu/(\zeta\Lambda)^2, \kappa c_T/\nu) = (\infty, 0). \tag{51}
$$

This actually corresponds to our MCT results. $d = 2$ is slightly delicate because the nontrivial fixed point of $\bar{\lambda}$ degenerates to the trivial one $\bar{\lambda}_* \to 0$ and the motion becomes much slower $\bar{\lambda} \sim 1/\sqrt{2A_d l}$, although $\bar{\lambda}$ in $d \neq 2$ shows the exponentially fast convergence. Thus, we must consider the transient behavior of $\bar{\lambda}$. Actually, previous works [7] revealed a nontrivial value $\bar{\kappa}$ in $d = 2$ with $\bar{Y} = 0$,

$$
(\mu/(\zeta\Lambda)^2, \kappa c_T/\nu) = (0, (1 + \sqrt{17})/2). \tag{52}
$$

The coefficient $\tilde{K}_d$ of ours is slightly different (factor 2) from that of [7] then the fixed point value of $\bar{\kappa}$ deviates from it, but this is subtle difference. The result for the

initial condition $\bar{Y} > 0$ is trivial compared with this result, but clearly shows this fixed point $\bar{\kappa} > 0$ actually unstable against the inclusion of rigidity. If $\bar{Y} \neq 0$ at the initial condition, the exponential grotwh of $\bar{Y} \sim \bar{Y}_0 e^{2l}$ also occurs even in $d = 2$ as l increases, therefore, using $\bar{\lambda} \sim 1/\sqrt{2A_d l}$, we can estimate the evolution of $\bar{\kappa}$ at $l \gg 1$ as

$$\bar{\kappa} \sim \bar{\kappa}_0/\sqrt{l}. \tag{53}$$

Then, slowly decreasing perturbation slowly pushes $\bar{\kappa}$ into 0, which means the convergence into the fixed point

$$(\mu/(\zeta\Lambda)^2, \kappa c_T/\nu) = (\infty, 0). \tag{54}$$

Thus, the rigidity-induced cutoff of the anomalous heat conduction still remains in $d = 2$, though the convergence becomes drastically slower.

Also, we show the RG result of the following fluidic equations to study the case $d = 1$, redefining $u := \rho v, Y := (\partial P/\partial\rho)_e$,

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t \delta\rho + \partial_x u &= 0 \\ \partial_t u + \rho_0^{-1}\partial_x u^2 &= -Y_0\partial_x\delta\rho + \nu_0\Delta u + \partial_x s \\ \partial_t \delta e + \rho_0^{-1}\partial_x u\delta e &= D\Delta\delta e + \partial_x g. \end{aligned} \tag{55}$$

This corresponds to the noisy Burgers equation with weak (temperature independent) pressure fluctuations and the passive scalar on the fluid [20]. It is completely fluidic (with no rigidity) but shows the competition of restoring forces and dissipations because of the dimensionality. With the same procedure, one gets [20]

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\nu}{dl} &= \nu(z - 2 + \bar{\lambda}^2/(2\pi)) \\ \frac{d\Sigma}{dl} &= \Sigma(z - 2 + \bar{\lambda}^2/(2\pi)) \\ \frac{d\lambda}{dl} &= \lambda(z - 3/2) \\ \frac{dY}{dl} &= Y(2z - 2) \\ \frac{dD}{dl} &= D\left[z - 2 + \frac{\bar{\lambda}^2}{2\pi}\frac{1}{\bar{\kappa}(1+\bar{\kappa}) + \bar{Y}}\right. \\ &\qquad \left. \times\left(\frac{5}{2} - \frac{\bar{\kappa}(1+3\bar{\kappa})}{\bar{\kappa}(1+\bar{\kappa}) + \bar{Y}}\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

In their study [20], the result of Σ was wrong (see *Appendix*). Corrected results actually preserve FDR after the renormalization. z is also chosen ν to be fixed at the initial value as $z = 2 - \bar{\lambda}^2/(2\pi)$. Then reduced flow is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\bar{\lambda}}{dl} &= \bar{\lambda}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\bar{\lambda}^2}{2\pi}\right) \\ \frac{d\bar{Y}}{dl} &= \bar{Y}(2 - \bar{\lambda}^2/\pi) \\ \frac{d\bar{\kappa}}{dl} &= \frac{\bar{\kappa}\bar{\lambda}^2}{2\pi}\left[-1 + \frac{1}{\bar{\kappa}(1+\bar{\kappa}) + \bar{Y}}\right. \\ &\qquad \left. \times\left(\frac{5}{2} - \frac{\bar{\kappa}(1+3\bar{\kappa})}{\bar{\kappa}(1+\bar{\kappa}) + \bar{Y}}\right)\right]. \end{aligned} \tag{57}$$

Also, it shows two typical fixed points similar to those of the elasticity of $d > 1$ around the stable fixed point of nonlinear intensity $\bar{\lambda} = \pi$ ($z = 3/2$),

$$\left(\frac{1}{(\nu\Lambda)^2}\left(\frac{\partial P}{\partial\rho}\right)_e, \frac{\kappa c_T}{\nu}\right) = (0, const(>0)), (\infty, 0). \tag{58}$$

The former is stable in $\bar{Y} = 0$, and the latter in $\bar{Y} > 0$. The nonzero value of sound velocity before the renormalization $\sqrt{Y} > 0$ is a required condition from thermodynamics, thus the recovery of Fourier's law unavoidably occurs in $d = 1$ at least in this model suggestion. Two examples (49) (57) demonstrate the universal aspects of the recovery of Fourier's law in low dimensional momentum-conserving systems, where restoring forces competing with the dissipations play the intrinsic roles.

The correspondence of statements is now clear between the two-dimensional incompressible fluids showing the anomaly [7] and one dimensional fluids with pressure showing the recovery [20]. The former has no shear reversible forces and their viscous stress is limited in the shear directions, thus dissipations have no competition with the restoring forces. On the other hand, the latter case shows the competition between pressure fluctuations and bulk viscosity, because the direction of the transport is strictly limited in $d = 1$. The generalization of the condition to yield the recovery of Fouriers law to $d > 1$ is not in the fluids but in the solids, because the recovery, at least in our semi-macroscopic descriptions, needs the inhabitation of shear directional dissipations in $d > 1$. Thus pressure cannot yield the recovery in $d > 1$, where rigidity is needed to inhibit the dissipations but infinitesimal rigidity can cut the anomaly as seen in the RG analysis.

Recently, the recovery Fourier's law has been reported even in two dimensional simulations [31] although it is considered to show the logarithmic divergence of heat conductivity [7, 32]. The classification would be possible as done in one dimensional cases [20]. The origin was classified into thermal activations and pressure fluctuations in the one dimensional cases [20, 22], therefore the origin in two-dimensional cases may be classified into thermal activations and elastic shear stress. Also, the slow convergence to the finite value of heat conductivity is seen in the two dimensional cases [31]. They changed the width W of two dimensional systems and checked the dimensionality crossover. They found the power-law slowing down of the convergence. Our RG model supports their results. Our result (53) suggests the power law convergence ($\sqrt{W}/\log W$) (or $W^{1/4}/\log W$ if the timescale cutoff is intrinsic) of heat conductivity, and their results suggest $W^{0.3}$ in $1 \leq W \leq 8$, mostly consistent with ours. Here we explain it briefly. The convergence of two dimensional systems are much slower than that of one dimensional systems as seen in (53). Thus, it can happen that the convergence in $d = 1$ ($W = 1$) is done but yet in $d = 2$ ($W > 1$). Because of the same reason, the corresponding convergence size of an width W is longer than that of thinner one $W' < W$. Then cutoff size (W) gives



FIG. 1. RG flow of $\bar{\kappa} = \kappa c_T/\nu$: (Left) (49), 2d incompressible elasticity (13). (Right) (57), 1d Burgers fluids added pressure (55). Initial conditions are chosen as $(\bar{\lambda}, \bar{Y}, \bar{\kappa}) = (1, 1, 1)$. Corresponding asymptotes going to 0 are shown by lines (Left: $l^{-1/2}$, Right: $e^{-l/2}$). They show the breakdwon of the hyperscaling between viscosity and heat conductivity.

the evaluation of the slowing down cutoff through (53) in the form as shown. This explanation is quite rough because their exponent is not for the convergence size but the growth rate of heat conductivity, we identified with the former in the above discussion, and because the log asymptote is not seen in theirs, but this would reflect the common phenomena with our semi-macroscopic descriptions at the point of the convergence slowing down with width increase. So it is also intriguing to check this point in the strict manner.

Experimentally, the explosive improvement has recently occurred in the experimental verifications of low dimensional anomalous transports using carbon-nanotubes and graphenes [11, 12]. Our analysis clarified the significance of rigidity, thus these solid systems are expected to show the saturation of the anomaly. It would be significant also for applications to clarify this point. At the larger sizes than the sizes showing the anomaly, we expect the saturation of the anomalous heat conduction as already seen in simulations [31] and in our analysis.

V. CONCLUSION

We generalized the findings of pressure-induced recovery of Fourier's law in one dimensional momentum-conserving systems to low dimensional ($d \leq 2$) systems (particularly for $d = 2$) and clarified that the possible physics behind of it is the competition between reversible forces and dissipations in momentum-transports. Therefore, rigidity becomes the intrinsic for the recovery in $d = 2$. Concretely, we first constructed the fluctuating elastic equations explicitly. In this formulations, we studied the perturbative effect of rigidity on the dynamics of conserved quantities, treating the famous incompressible cases [7] as the representative model of the formulations. As a result, it was shown that the anomaly cutoff naturally follows the restoring force of velocity fields. It comes from rigidity in $d > 1$. Combining the RG result of this model and that of one dimensional fluids of finite pressure, we clarified the universal aspects of the recovery that the recovery occurs because of the competitions between reversible forces and dissipative ones and the difference of $d = 2$ from $d = 1$ that elastic order is needed (only) in $d = 2$ for the recovery. This result was shown on those quite general situations, so this would give us the example of universal normal transport in low dimensional momentum-conserving systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author gratefully acknowledges helpful discussions with H. Hayakawa and S. Takesue, and encouragements with T. Hatano.

Appendix A: Evaluation of renormalized noise terms

We show the evaluation of renormalization into the noise terms. We particularly focus on the following term,

$$F'' := \int \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} |G|^2(\mathbf{q}^+, \omega/2 + \Omega)|G|^2(\mathbf{q}^-, \omega/2 - \Omega)$$
$$= \sum_{\pm,\pm_2=\pm 1} i\mathrm{Res}[|G|^2(\mathbf{q}^+, \omega/2 + \Omega)|G|^2(\mathbf{q}^-, \omega/2 - \Omega)$$
$$, \Omega = \mp_2 \frac{\omega}{2} + \frac{i\nu_0}{2}(q^{\pm_2})^2 \pm \sqrt{}(q^{\pm_2})]. \qquad \text{(A1)}$$

This term is common among (13), (55) for the renormalization into the random stress. For example, the noise renormalization ($\hat{f}_{Ra} = \hat{f}_a + \lambda\delta v_a^{(1)} + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^2)$) of (13), (20)

contains,

$$(P_{ce}\sigma^{>}) * (P_{df}\sigma^{>}) = \int_{\Lambda>q^{\pm}>\Lambda e^{-l}} d\mathbf{q} \times \frac{D_0^2}{(2\pi)^{2d+1}}(q^+q^-)^2 P_{ce}(\mathbf{q}^+)P_{df}(\mathbf{q}^-)F''. \quad \text{(A2)}$$

The previous work [20] made a mistake on the evaluation of this term and constructed the wrong RG flow. After accurate calculations, it shows the irrelevance of reversible forces for the renormalization into ramdom stress parts. This term can be evaluated as follows. Using

$$G^*(q^{\pm_2}, \frac{i\nu_0}{2}(q^{\pm_2})^2 \pm \sqrt{}(q^{\pm_2})) = \frac{1}{2\nu_0 q^2}(1 \mp_2 \mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{k}/q^2) \quad \text{(A3)}$$

$$G(q^{\mp_2}, \mp_2\omega - \frac{i\nu_0}{2}(q^{\pm_2})^2 \mp \sqrt{}(q^{\pm_2})) = \frac{1}{2\nu_0 q^2}\left(1 \mp_2 \frac{\omega \pm \partial_{\mathbf{q}}\sqrt{}\cdot\mathbf{k}}{i\nu_0 q^2} \pm_2 \frac{\omega + i\nu_0\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{k} \pm \partial_{\mathbf{q}}\sqrt{}\cdot k}{i\nu_0 q^2 \pm 2\sqrt{}} + \mathcal{O}(\omega^2, k^2, \omega k)\right) \quad \text{(A4)}$$

$$\frac{\frac{i\nu_0}{2}(q^{\pm_2})^2 \pm \sqrt{}(q^{\pm_2})}{\pm 2\sqrt{}(q^{\pm_2})} = \frac{\sqrt{} \pm \frac{i\nu_0}{2}q^2}{2\sqrt{}} \times \left(1 \mp_2 \frac{\partial_{\mathbf{q}}\sqrt{}\cdot\mathbf{k}}{2\sqrt{}} \pm_2 \frac{\partial_{\mathbf{q}}\sqrt{}\cdot\mathbf{k} \pm i\nu_0\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{k}}{2\sqrt{} \pm i\nu_0 q^2} + \mathcal{O}(k^2)\right) \quad \text{(A5)}$$

$$G^*(\mathbf{q}^{\mp_2}, \mp_2\omega - \frac{i\nu_0}{2}(q^{\pm_2})^2 \mp \sqrt{}(q^{\pm_2})) = \frac{1}{\pm 2i\sqrt{}}\left[\pm_2 \frac{\pm_2\omega/2 + \frac{i\nu_0}{2}q^2 \pm \sqrt{}}{\omega + i\nu_0\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{k} \pm \partial_{\mathbf{q}}\sqrt{}\cdot\mathbf{k}} + 1/2\right] \left(1 \mp_2 \frac{\omega + i\nu_0\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{k}}{\pm 2\sqrt{}} + \mathcal{O}(\omega^2, k^2, \omega k)\right), \quad \text{(A6)}$$

we arrive at

$$F'' = 1/(4\nu_0^3 q^6) + \mathcal{O}(\omega, k). \quad \text{(A7)}$$

This means the irrelevance of rigidity in $d > 1$ and pressure fluctuations in $d = 1$ for the renormalization into the random shear stress.

[1] L. Landau and E. Lifshitz, "Fluid mechanics (; oxford)," (1987).
[2] S. R. De Groot and P. Mazur, *Non-equilibrium thermodynamics* (Courier Corporation, 2013).
[3] R. Kubo, M. Toda, and N. Hashitsume, *Statistical physics II: nonequilibrium statistical mechanics*, Vol. 31 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2012).
[4] U. Seifert, Reports on Progress in Physics **75**, 126001 (2012).
[5] K. Kawasaki and I. Oppenheim, Physical Review **139**, A1763 (1965).
[6] Y. Pomeau and P. Resibois, Physics Reports **19**, 63 (1975).
[7] D. Forster, D. R. Nelson, and M. J. Stephen, Physical Review A **16**, 732 (1977).
[8] S. Lepri, R. Livi, and A. Politi, Physics Reports **377**, 1 (2003).
[9] S. Lepri, R. Livi, and A. Politi, in *Thermal Transport in Low Dimensions* (Springer, 2016) pp. 1–37.
[10] O. Narayan and S. Ramaswamy, Physical review letters **89**, 200601_1 (2002).
[11] C.-W. Chang, D. Okawa, H. Garcia, A. Majumdar, and A. Zettl, Physical review letters **101**, 075903 (2008).
[12] A. A. Balandin, Nature materials **10**, 569 (2011).
[13] A. V. Savin and Y. A. Kosevich, Physical Review E **89**, 032102 (2014).
[14] O. V. Gendelman and A. V. Savin, Physical review letters **84**, 2381 (2000).
[15] Y. Zhong, Y. Zhang, J. Wang, and H. Zhao, Physical Review E **85**, 060102 (2012).
[16] S. Chen, Y. Zhang, J. Wang, and H. Zhao, arXiv preprint arXiv:1204.5933 (2012).
[17] S. G. Das, A. Dhar, and O. Narayan, Journal of Statistical Physics **154**, 204 (2014).
[18] S. Chen, J. Wang, G. Casati, and G. Benenti, Physical Review E **90**, 032134 (2014).
[19] J. Jiang and H. Zhao, Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment **2016**, 093208 (2016).
[20] D. SK. Sato, Phys. Rev. E **94**, 012115 (2016).
[21] S. G. Das and A. Dhar, arXiv preprint arXiv:1411.5247 (2014).
[22] O. V. Gendelman and A. V. Savin, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **106**, 34004 (2014).
[23] Y. A. Kosevich and A. V. Savin, arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.03219 (2015).
[24] L. D. Landau and E. M. Lifshitz, *Course of theoretical physics, Theory of elasticity* (Pergamon Press, 1986).
[25] B. Drossel and M. Kardar, Physical Review B **66**, 195414 (2002).
[26] T. Mai and O. Narayan, Physical Review E **73**, 061202 (2006).
[27] K. Saito and A. Dhar, Physical review letters **107**, 250601 (2011).
[28] S.-i. Karato, *Deformation of earth materials: an introduction to the rheology of solid earth* (Cambridge University Press, 2012).
[29] H. Spohn, in *Thermal Transport in Low Dimensions* (Springer, 2016) pp. 107–158.
[30] I. J. Aitchison and A. J. Hey, *Gauge Theories in Particle Physics: A Practical Introduction, Volume 2: Non-Abelian Gauge Theories: QCD and The Electroweak Theory*, Vol. 2 (CRC Press, 2012).
[31] A. Savin, V. Zolotarevskiy, and O. Gendelman, EPL (Europhysics Letters) **113**, 24003 (2016).
[32] A. Lippi and R. Livi, Journal of Statistical Physics **100**, 1147 (2000).